



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,245	08/21/2002	Toshihiro Sadaoka	50069-11	4541

20277 7590 10/01/2004

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
600 13TH STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

CHOI, FRANK I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1616

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

10/089,245

Applicant(s)

SADAOKA ET AL.

Examiner

Frank I Choi

Art Unit

1616

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



**S. MARK CLARDY**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**  
**GROUP 1200** 1616

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner has duly considered Applicant's arguments but deems them unpersuasive. Applicant argues that there is no evidence that the claimed invention was derived from another. However, the IDS and the references JP'820 and JP'248 indicate that Daio Paper Corporation is the assignee which was listed as an assignee in Applicant's own priority document JP 2000-234908. Further, as indicated in Section 2137 of the MPEP a rejection under 35 USC 102(f) does not require an inquiry into the relative dates of a reference and the application. With respect to the 103 rejection, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Further, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Applicant's arguments do not overcome the rejection in that JP'628 and JP'411 were solely relied upon for their teachings of properties of hydroxyapatite which were not disclosed in the primary references, i.e. absorption of oxidized lipids. The primary reference EP '723 already disclosed the combination of hydroxyapatite and talc on paper. The motivation is clearly taught by the prior art in that one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected that the product disclosed by EP'723 would effectively absorb oxidized sebum. In response to applicant's argument that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to either JP'628 JP'411, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The prior art references are in Applicant's field of endeavor and are reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which applicant was concerned in that JP'411 and JP'628 disclose and Applicant was concerned with the topical application of hydroxyapatite to absorb oxidized oils. Applicant arguments do not provide evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art would not recognize JP'411 and JP'628 would be applicable to cosmetic-type papers disclosed by the primary reference EP' 723. As indicated above, EP'723 already disclosed the use of hydroxyapatite in a cosmetic paper which is applied to the skin. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would look to art which describes the properties of hydroxyapatite as used on the skin.